

It has been repeatedly reported that the President does not sit for briefings, does not read the reports that are provided to him, does not stick to speeches on policies that are written for him, and, frankly, shows very little interest in participating in the administrative responsibilities that most Presidents go through in order to learn what is a very big job.

Yes, the job of the President of the United States is a very big job, and anybody who gets into that job, just as I do in this body as a new Member of Congress, we try to learn the rules. We go to the people who know the most. We ask them to give us briefings. We suck up as much information as we possibly can so that we understand both content and process.

But, unfortunately, this President has not done any of that, and he has made many unforced errors. Frankly, he has put our national security at risk by giving secrets away to Russia, insulting key allies who have now said that they won't share information with us because they don't trust that we are going to be able to keep it secret.

NATO and our allies in the European Union, where I just came back from, everybody around the world is unsure of what leadership, if any, to expect from the United States of America.

Angela Merkel said it the best when she said: We can't rely on anybody else anymore. And she said: We, as a European Union, have to just come together and rely on ourselves.

And while that is great for the European Union, I am glad that there is something that has happened here that has drawn the European Union together. It is an incredibly important entity for the world and has been doing remarkable work. But what I would hope, Mr. Speaker, is that countries around the world know that the United States is going to continue to take global leadership, is going to continue to demonstrate that global leadership, and, most of all, is going to be trusted to make relationships and respect the rules of those relationships.

The American people are aware that the President's background is not in politics. However, the White House is not "The Apprentice." Had a new employee in The Trump Organization made as many errors as have been made in this administration, he would have been fired a long time ago.

The American people deserve better. And not only do we demand that the President not intervene in any negative way in Director Mueller's investigation—and we are very pleased that Director Mueller has been appointed. I believe that was an incredibly important step that Assistant Attorney General Rod Rosenstein took to appoint somebody with the credibility that Mueller has—but we hope that this investigation will continue, because I think it is important for the American people to understand that this is not an independent investigator, or prosecutor. This is special counsel.

So that still means that anything that Director Mueller finds in his findings, his reports, they do get run up the chain of command at the Department of Justice. So if you watched yesterday's Senate Intelligence Committee hearings, you might have seen Senator KAMALA HARRIS discuss this and ask Rod Rosenstein if he could assure that there really would be independence, that neither Rosenstein nor Jeff Sessions would get involved in trying to change or influence, in any way, whatever Director Mueller comes up with.

She was not given that assurance yesterday, unfortunately, and so we still don't know. But we have to hope and believe that the President and this administration will preserve the independence of the special counsel and will take all of the findings and the recommendations as to what they are presented and not try to change them.

I really believe, Mr. Speaker, at this point, that while the special counsel is an important step forward, I join my colleague Mr. RASKIN and many others in this caucus, in our Democratic Caucus, in calling for a special commission, an independent commission, similar to the 9/11 Commission, filled with citizens—not with Members of Congress but with respected citizens—and people with expertise, as well as those citizens, to actually come together and think not only about the immediate impact of how we get to the bottom of what has happened, but, really, how do we prevent this going forward?

What we are talking about is the sanctity of our democracy; we are talking about whether our elections can be free of influence from other countries; we are talking about if an American citizen casts a vote here in the United States for the President of the United States, that that vote is not being influenced by a foreign government who has hacked our elections, or worked in collusion with a campaign for the President of the United States; and that ultimately, whoever we select, whether it is this President or any President in the future, that that President must be responsible to the American people.

That is what democracy is about. We don't want any President, now or in the future, to ever be in a situation where there is information that can be used against them, where they could be blackmailed, leveraged, or where they are actively colluding with any government outside of this country.

These are our elections. It is what makes this country great. It is why so many people from all around the world look at America with tremendous gratitude, with tremendous respect, even awe for the way in which we have constructed our democracy. That is part of what goes on in this Chamber, and we need to know that the election of the President of this great country is always an election that the American people have faith in, and that democracy is preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I think what James Comey's testimony showed us today is,

we got a lot of answers, but we didn't get enough answers. There is still more information that we need to find. There is more information that the Senate Intelligence Committee needs to find. There is more information that the President may have to provide, and there is more information that the American people are going to demand in order to ensure that we get to the bottom of where we are, that we get an independent commission established, and that we allow Director Mueller, in his investigation, to proceed without any interference.

That is the least that we have to be willing to do, and we have to be willing to put country above party as we try to ensure that we understand exactly what has happened. The American people deserve that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

□ 1815

FORMER FBI DIRECTOR COMEY'S SENATE TESTIMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to come before and stand before the Speaker and stand on this floor where so much great debate has occurred over the decades, even back to 150 years ago.

Now, I have been heard to say over the last few days a number of times that I thought the Comey testimony was ultimately the most overhyped event since Y2K, much ado about nothing, but one thing came through very, very, very clearly. I didn't watch the testimony. I was busy presiding over a hearing involving the Justice Department and grants to local communities and how that money is being spent, but I have gone back and been reviewing the testimony. The thing that strikes me most clearly is that our President, Donald J. Trump, is one of the most perceptive, intuitive leaders this country has ever had. He wasn't sure, apparently, if he could trust Comey.

Now, we have heard from a lot of other people in the administration, some still there, some not. This issue about the President's concern for loyalty with Comey indicates our President's gut instinct was right on. He was dealing with an FBI Director who was such a political animal that he would listen to the Attorney General of the United States and instruct him to change his testimony to—I would submit, when you know it is an investigation that you are engaged in, looking at the emails and the potential criminality of Hillary Clinton, and your boss, the Attorney General, said: No, no, no—obviously it is an investigation—call it a matter.

Nobody calls the FBI investigations matters. So he has no problem changing his statement from the truth to political manipulation to cover for Hillary Clinton and to immediately do

what his boss tells him to do: Lie about it. You know it is an investigation and I know it is an investigation, but we need you to lie about it. Just call it a matter.

I have dealt with some of the finest people I have known in my life that happened to work for the FBI at the time we were working together. I worked with them, and I have never, ever in any Federal court setting or Federal investigation setting heard any FBI agent in charge—field agent, leader in the FBI, the Justice Department—call an investigation a matter. But Mr. Comey is such a political animal that he was willing to salute not the flag, but Hillary Clinton and Loretta Lynch and change what he knew to be the truth so that his answer was more misleading.

So it is really interesting. Comey used the word, or said that Trump used the word, hoped that he would let it go.

Let's visit the Constitution briefly here. The Constitution does not mention an Attorney General. The Constitution does not mention the Federal Bureau of Investigation and does not mention a Federal Bureau of Investigation Director. It mentions Congress, it mentions the courts, and it mentions the executive branch, the President. It doesn't mention FBI Director, Attorney General. It is the President, under our Constitution, who is charged with seeing to the prosecution or the failure to prosecute as he believes is appropriate.

So, of course, somebody had to have been committing crimes in the Fast and Furious project, whatever you want to call it. I am not sure what it was. It sure appeared to be a criminal enterprise with people involved from DOJ conspiring to make sure that weapons got into the hands of criminals, which, in and of itself, was a crime.

We also know that by the Department of Justice's representatives getting involved during the Obama administration as part of this Fast and Furious effort, they called it, guns got into the hands of criminals, and Brian Terry was killed, a Federal agent doing his job. There is no indication that if the Department of Justice had not forced those guns to be sold and to get into the hands of criminals that Brian Terry would not be dead.

If the Department of Justice had not forced this issue, forced guns into criminals' hands, we may very well have been hearing Brian Terry testify a number of times instead of pointing back toward his murder at the hands of criminals who our Department of Justice representatives under Eric Holder got guns to.

It might have been good to have a special counsel in the Fast and Furious investigation—or, as Loretta Lynch and Mr. Comey liked to use to deceive people, matter, Fast and Furious matter—because the truth is they didn't do much of an investigation.

We saw emails indicating that there was an effort to try to use getting

those guns into the hands of criminals, drug cartels, as an excuse to take away law-abiding Americans' Second Amendment rights and continue to pursue that effort.

We also know that the IRS had people who were working to prevent conservatives from having an effect in the 2012 election the way they did in 2010. As the movement was growing, the Obama administration used the IRS as a political weapon to disarm those who would bring together funds and try to defeat President Obama in a second term. That certainly deserved a special counsel since all we seemed to get in our investigations from Congress' angle was a coverup.

It harkens us back to the Clinton administration when this tactic was discovered by people within the Clinton administration: Just cover things up. Just deny, obfuscate, and refuse to allow people to see the documentation. Destroy it after somebody dies. Get the records out of their office before anyone else has a chance to properly investigate what happened.

Somebody is alleged to have killed themselves at Fort Marcy Park. Then as I heard from my friend Dan Burton, they were questioning the person that supposedly found the body out there: Well, that is not where it was. That is not where the gun was. Everything appears to be changed.

Well, the Clinton administration discovered this wonderful tactic of obfuscating: just keep denying and denying the ability to get information and records, and if you do it long enough, you run out the clock and people don't get prosecuted.

We have seen that occur for 8 years. There were very, very serious matters in which somebody committed crimes. We didn't get a special investigator. We didn't get a proper investigation. We got a stonewall protecting those who must have done wrong. I am hoping the current Attorney General will dig and people that are responsible for crimes will be held to account.

But the fact is it is the President's obligation under the Constitution to either pursue people or not pursue people. That is why, even though many of us were extremely upset that President Obama kept pardoning people who were convicted felons, and as much as it upset us that he, in a literal sense, not only obstructed justice, he destroyed it, unfortunately, the President has authority to demand people not be prosecuted.

So we heard new priorities around the country when President Obama took office. He didn't want his Justice Department spending a lot of time on enforcing drug laws. It turns out they hardly ever prosecuted. Compared to other administrations, they hardly ever prosecuted criminal gun violations—far fewer than past administrations—because what they wanted to do was allow the gun crimes to continue to ratchet out of control and then use that to demand more gun control when

they weren't even using the laws that were in effect. Instead of enforcing the laws in effect, they continued to demand more gun control.

Just enforce what we had. Most all the crimes that were brought up during that period were crimes already without any other gun control laws needing to be passed and signed into law. Just enforce what we have.

But that wasn't happening. Nobody stood up and said President Obama should be prosecuted for obstruction of justice, because as distasteful as it was to me and so many others, the President has a right to set priorities as to what his prosecutors will pursue and what will be left alone.

So it is interesting on the Flynn matter. President Trump had every right to say: Look, I am giving a pardon, a pass, to this person and to that person. Let's move on. I hope you will find something else to do.

Trump didn't even do that. President Trump said he hoped, an aspiration, but there was no obstruction of justice.

How do we know that? Because we have found, through the testimony of former Director Comey, an incredibly innate ability to see everything through a political lens instead of a law-and-order lens. That is why he could have one Attorney General telling him, "Change what you are going to say so it deceives the public," and that is not a problem, we don't do a memo about that, but another President indicates: He is concerned about my loyalty and he brings it up, so I better do memos so that I can take him down later because he doesn't trust me.

□ 1830

Well, for good reason. The loyalty was to Loretta Lynch, the loyalty was to Hillary Clinton, the loyalty was to Barack Obama.

And Trump, what an incredible innate ability. He knew Comey was not a loyal, law-and-order man. He would twist the truth, as he was directed by someone else, but he would also twist an untruth through, hurting the current President.

It appears President Donald J. Trump was exactly right in firing Comey. We didn't need to continue to have a politically astute diplomat wannabe running our FBI. We needed somebody that was law and order, no matter what.

Alan Dershowitz is a staunch Democrat, but through the years and with the things I disagreed with him on, I know he is a smart man. Here are some of the things he tweeted out:

"Comey says he understood word 'hope' to be a direction. If so, why didn't he tell the President that such a direction would be violation of DOJ rules?"

Well, here, again, the fact is, if Director-at-the-time Comey believed there was any effort to obstruct justice, then he was committing a crime, a felony, by not reporting it.

I was surprised that he went as far as he did today—because he did—by pushing as hard as he did on this idea that

saying “hope” might have been a direction. The more he pushed that, the more he exposed himself to prosecution for a felony because he didn’t report it.

But the truth is, even though he wrongly believed that there was something—a violation of law or obstruction—it wasn’t. If he honestly believed that, he had to report it, and he didn’t.

Oh, yeah, he did a memo. I wonder if we would have ever seen that memo if he had not been fired. I can guarantee if he had not been fired, from what we have now learned today, you can count on the fact that he, as Director of the FBI, would make memos any time it might help him harm President Donald Trump, but he would continue not to do memos when somebody, a Democrat, told him to mislead the public.

Alan Dershowitz said: If President commits independent crimes, for example, Nixon telling the staff to lie to the FBI, that is a crime.

You can’t tell somebody to commit a crime, even if you are President.

Alan Dershowitz said: Paying dollars to silence witnesses is a crime.

You can’t commit a crime or tell somebody to commit a crime even though you are President. That is obstruction. You should be prosecuted.

Mr. Dershowitz said: “Comey confirmed my view that, under the Constitution, the President would have the authority to order FBI Director to stop investigating Flynn.”

He would. Just as Barack Obama says: I pardon you, I am taking away the justice that has been done in your case. I am obstructing justice.

In pardon after pardon, he obstructed justice. But when a President does it, as Obama did being President Obama, it was not a crime when he pardoned people.

Now, if you have a President that has somebody rich, whether that is their name or just their monetary status, and they give you a bunch of their richness and you pardon them, then you may have sold part of your office, which could very well be a crime, and probably is.

But in the case of President Obama, there is no indication anybody paid him to pardon people. If nobody paid him, he just did it because he thought it was a good idea to have people involved with drugs out on the street again, or people at Guantanamo Bay back killing Americans. If he thinks that is a good idea, then he can legally obstruct justice, which President Obama legally did time and time again.

Alan Dershowitz also says, talking about Comey: “He confirmed that the President can order anyone to be investigated or not be investigated.”

Dershowitz also said: “Comey stated the constitutional principle: President has authority to direct FBI to end a criminal investigation. Can also pardon anyone, ending investigation.”

There is somebody on the internet that goes by the pseudonym “Ace of Spades.” This guy has a wicked wit.

Ace of Spades sent out this tweet as if he is quoting Comey. These are Ace

of Spades’ words—an interpretation of the testimony today—he says, Comey: Loretta Lynch told me to lie and I didn’t write that down, but I wrote down Trump’s stuff because I was afraid he would lie.

Wow. It has got the networks all stirred up that former FBI Director Comey came in today and actually exposed the disloyalty to the President of the United States, to the Constitution, to the things he swore to uphold and protect.

Let’s look at one other thing I hadn’t heard anybody else mention. When you have an attorney as the FBI Director and he is talking to the President of the United States, there is a privilege involved there. Even the least modicum of loyalty and honor and integrity would cause someone who is taking an oath as an attorney, someone who has taken an oath as Director of the FBI, someone that knows their boss is the President and that all power is in the President for the executive branch and the FBI Director entirely gets his power from the President, it would be some smidgeon of honor to want to protect those private conversations.

As far as we know, they weren’t classified, but it is something called privilege, it is something called loyalty, and it is something called honor.

The testimony we heard today was the former FBI Director saying: When it came to President Trump, I wasn’t going to honor our privileged conversations. I wasn’t going to honor the executive privilege. I wasn’t going to honor the fact that my power as FBI Director and the authority to investigate someone or not investigate someone is derived entirely from the President of the United States. I will honor a person that tells me to misrepresent the truth, but I am not going to honor someone who is concerned about fairness.

Even though the FBI Director knows better than most anyone else there is no evidence of collusion between the Russians and Donald Trump, there is no evidence of collusion with anybody in the Trump administration at this time, yet there was no sense of loyalty there.

Think of Shakespeare’s words and the sarcasm of Marc Antony. Brutus says he is an honorable man. They are all honorable men. These are honorable people who told me to misrepresent the truth to the American people and to the press. These are people that love me because I leak things.

I was hoping for one question that I should have contacted one of my Senator friends and told them to ask, because I would like to know the truth. I know that my Democratic friends were so furious, just livid at Comey when, just days before the election, he announces he is reopening the investigation.

The rumor around here was that there were FBI agents who had been investigating and they knew that Hillary

Clinton had violated the law all kinds of ways. Intent was not an issue. She had taken classified material into an unclassified computer and sent it to unclassified computers.

Comey said: Clean bill of health. Everything is good.

And they knew it wasn’t good. So when they saw this was the rumor floating around, I would like to know the truth.

You know some FBI agents had to have found Anthony Weiner’s computer and found tens of thousands of emails that we were told had been destroyed. Oh, we can’t get those tens of thousands of emails. They are gone. And then they found them. Not only were they not in a classified area, not in a SCIF, not in a classified connection, laptop, not even in a government employee’s laptop. They were on the laptop of someone who had shown the worst judgment in the world.

You want to talk about the potential for blackmailing—although, probably by this time, I don’t know what you would have to come up with to blackmail him, because it is pretty well all out there. Nonetheless, all of these emails were found that were supposed to be gone. There is absolutely no question that some of them came to Hillary Clinton, were sent to an unclassified setting, and now, not only that, they are in the hands of Anthony Weiner, who has had his own criminal justice issues.

The rumor continued that we had such honorable FBI agents that they said, in essence: Mr. Director, clearly, this is criminal material and evidence. If you don’t announce you are reopening the investigation, we are going to resign, have a press conference, and show the world that you have been covering for Hillary Clinton the whole time.

Now, that was the rumor. If that were true, and, under those type circumstances, Director Comey then rushes out just days before the election and said, I am reopening the investigation because we found these emails, then that would make sense. He certainly would want FBI agents to completely destroy any election chances just days before the election of Hillary Clinton.

If Director Comey went out and said: I am reopening the investigation, even though Republicans were rejoicing and Democrats were livid, as I pointed out to someone back at the time in the media, I guess it could hurt Hillary Clinton.

But if Director Comey comes out a day or two before the election and says there is nothing here, clean bill of health, Hillary Clinton is great, no problems, when we knew he didn’t have time, nobody had time to adequately review the tens of thousands of emails, you could run a few algorithms. Real law enforcement means looking at the evidence line by line—I have known people who did it; I have done it in a civil setting—until you find the smoking gun. But you have got to go

through the monotony of reviewing each of those.

□ 1845

They had no time to do that, and yet former Director Comey came out, clean bill of health. It could not have been discerned in that amount of time like that. So it appeared pretty clearly the reason he said we are reopening the case was so he could say we closed it, to eliminate any chance of even a non-FBI person who comes forward and says, you know, there are classified emails that ended up on Anthony Weiner's computer that came from Hillary Clinton, to Huma, and to Weiner. There were crimes here, and the FBI Director is covering for him. That would likely have brought down Hillary Clinton much worse than the defeat she suffered.

So it is just interesting, but, Mr. Speaker, the irony with which former Director Comey's testimony drips this evening is that our President, Donald J. Trump, he has got good gut instincts. He had concerns that former Director Comey was disloyal, was manipulative, that he may be someone that the United States Government should not trust, and it turns out President Trump's gut instincts were exactly right.

He committed no crime. That has become clear. And so now we expect we will see the media and my friends on the other side of the aisle quit talking about Russia—there is nothing there, there has been nothing there—unless we start looking at potential prosecution for taking millions and millions of dollars from owners of Uranium One, who gave those to the Clinton Foundation, which then again ended up benefiting the Clinton family, and Hillary Clinton then approves Russia getting around 25 percent of our uranium production, to the potential detriment and, possibly in future altercations, death of Americans at the hands of the uranium that Hillary Clinton profited from potentially mightily, even if it wasn't directly, and yet America suffered.

Look, it is time to talk about real crimes, investigate real crimes, investigate racketeer influence of corrupt organizations that would pay for people to commit violence at Trump events. Now we are talking.

America deserves better, and thank God we are going to have a new FBI Director. Former Director Comey did some good things while at the FBI, but, unfortunately, we saw the extent that politics tainted the Director today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 12, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1547. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule; Delay of Effective Date [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0183; FRL-9963-34] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1548. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Erie County, PA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2017-0002; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8481] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1549. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fans [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0045] (RIN: 1904-AD28) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1550. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [EERE-2014-BT-STD-0048] (RIN: 1904-AD37) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1551. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Dedicated-Purpose Pool Pumps [EERE-2015-BT-STD-0008] (RIN: 1904-AD52) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1552. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Tennessee's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Davidson, Rutherford, Sumner, Williamson, and Wilson Counties; and Minor Technical Corrections for Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standards in Other Areas

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2016-0631; FRL-9963-54-OAR] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1553. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Nevada Air Plan Revisions, Clark County Department of Air Quality and Washoe County Health District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0653; FRL-9963-43-Region 9] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1554. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0318; FRL-9960-07-Region 9] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1555. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming; Negative Declarations [EPA-R08-OAR-2017-0171; FRL-9963-21-Region 8] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1556. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Nevada, Lake Tahoe; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0399; FRL-9963-25-Region 9] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1557. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; CT; Approval of Single Source Orders; Correction [EPA-R01-OAR-2016-0648; A-1-FRL-9962-83-Region 1] received June 2, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1558. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Main Branch of the Chicago River, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0196] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1559. A letter from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, St. Louis, MO [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0319] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1560. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Stuart, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0167] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received June 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.